
Critical Infrastructure Protection

By

**Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs**

[The following remarks were presented at the American Embassy, New Delhi, India, April 30, 2002.]

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for joining me here at the American Embassy this afternoon. I would like to make a few brief remarks before I answer your questions. I wish to first thank my Indian hosts for their hospitality, and for the seriousness of purpose that they shared with me and with my colleagues during two days of meetings here in New Delhi.

As you may have seen in this morning's newspapers, yesterday, I took part in the inaugural session of the Indo-U.S. Cyber Security Forum, which is an outgrowth of the Indo-U.S. Cyber-Terrorism Initiative launched by Prime Minister Vajpayee and President Bush at their November 9, 2001, Summit meeting in Washington. My host at these talks was Shri Arvind Gupta, Joint Secretary for the National Security Council Secretariat. Today, I participated in the first Indo-U.S. Political Military Dialogue. I was hosted by Mr. Jayant Prasad, Joint Secretary, Americas, MEA. I wish to thank both of these gentlemen and their impressive respective teams for the very warm hospitality and well-organized structure of these two sets of discussions.

As Assistant Secretary for the State Department's Political-Military Bureau (PM), I am Secretary Powell's principal advisor on matters where the Department of State supports the mission of the Department of Defense, and am an active participant in the management of America's security relationships worldwide. My bureau's mission includes advising the Secretary of State on U.S. security assistance programs such as the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, Foreign Military Financing (FMF), and Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) assistance. Additionally, I am responsible for U.S. government arms sales policy and for commercial defense trade controls, including licensing. Other areas of PM's responsibility include contingency planning and peacekeeping policy, the small arms/light weapons United Nations Program of Action, humanitarian demining, and mine action, base access and burden sharing, and international consequence management coordination, as well as critical infrastructure protection cooperation internationally.

It is in this last capacity that I held meetings yesterday, April 29, 2002 with Joint Secretary Gupta and the members of his Cyber security team. The U.S. delegation in these talks represented the full range of U.S. government agencies as well as university representatives, working on critical infrastructure protection (CIP). This U.S. team is the most comprehensive and senior delegation we have ever assembled for a bilateral CIP discussion with any country.

We presented our assessment of the global threat and described the measures we have taken to minimize the vulnerability of our critical information systems. The two sides began the dialogue on possible ways in which India and the United States can address these problems. These talks marked the start of what will be a regular relationship between India and the U.S. on cyber security. Indeed, the professional-level dialogue from here on will be continuous. Members of our respective delegations will be in touch as often as needed in order to protect both India's and America's critical infrastructure from cyber attack.

The purpose of today's political-military dialogue was to set the stage for a closer and even more productive bilateral security relationship. I had the opportunity to hear in detail India's

strategic perspectives, priorities, and visions for the future in the context of the regional and international security environment. I was also able to present American perspectives on Operation Enduring Freedom and the Global War on Terrorism. The discussions included Indian military modernization and India's perspectives on the U.S. as a potential defense supplier. I was able to share with my hosts the progress of current defense procurement requests and explain in detail the U.S. defense trade licensing process and U.S. arms transfer policy.

I will return to Washington tonight with what I know will be good news for Secretary Powell: political-military relations between the United States and India are strong and growing. I consider it an honor and a privilege to be able to play a role in deepening the transformation of our bilateral relationship.

Question: Mr. Bloomfield, I am Aditi Phadnis, the *Business Standard Newspaper*. Do you have an ongoing dialogue on cyber security with other nations of the world, and if so, what are the areas that they encompass? This is not a subject that we know too much about here.

Answer: Yes, we do. Cyber security is a relative newcomer to the bureaucratic environment in Washington and it is clearly an outgrowth of the phenomenal proliferation of computers and information technology and the internet. The organizations represented on the U.S. delegation in the last two days in the main did not exist a few years ago. Now we find that our own government bureaucracy, our defense and intelligence establishments, must guard its information infrastructure against all manner of cyber threats.

In addition, most of the critical infrastructure in the United States is not government owned or government operated. It belongs to the private sector, the financial markets in particular, and the entire range of corporations and small businesses. So, in the United States, the government needs to enlist the cooperation of the private sector to work collegially for their own mutual benefit. As you know, national borders do not exist when it comes to cyber space so we have to be attentive to the dangers of a cascading failure of infrastructure that could begin anywhere on the globe and carry from one substantial infrastructure into another country's infrastructure at very high speed. For that reason the U.S. has begun CIP dialogues with a number of our closest friends and partners in the economic sphere. It is quite appropriate that we should come to New Delhi insofar as India's presence in the international cyber environment and in the global market is significant and is destined to grow quite substantially.

Question: I am Ajay Shukla from *Star News*. Does this cooperation between our two countries have more to do with India's strength in software development, or developing relationships in strategic terms? Would you say it's both or is it due more to India's strength in software?

Answer: I think there is an element of both, but even if we did not have a very positive bilateral relationship the connectivity between the two countries in the information sphere would drive the U.S. to come together to address potential mutual vulnerabilities. There is no reason why India should be unaware of a virus or an attack that we have discovered in the United States if it is possible for the U.S. to inform our counterparts in India quickly and immediately and send different kinds of patches and software solutions to guard India's information infrastructure. And vice versa, when India discovers something and can tell the U.S. about it in a timely manner. This is the nature of the 21st century information environment, and frankly, to address your question more specifically, it is a reflection of the large size of India's software industry but it is also, I believe, a recognition that the size of India's information technology economy could grow quite dramatically from the already impressive level of today.

Question: Does it seem we will receive cooperation from the Indian industry as well as the United States industry for solutions, security resolutions? How will this work?

Answer: Thank you for the question. I mentioned U.S. industry for illustrative purposes. Eight-five to ninety percent of America's critical infrastructure is not owned by the government. The U.S., as you may know, is a country born of revolution. We take our independence as citizens very seriously. So it is not automatic that the U.S. government can enlist the active cooperation of all the private sector in the United States. Other countries have a slightly different tradition. The fact is that India's private sector has a very important place in the future of this dialogue; how that comes to pass remains to be seen.

Question: I am Ranjit Kumar from *Navbharat Times*. Will you also be conducting joint research programs on ways to protect this cyber infrastructure?

Answer: We had a very extensive delegation on both sides of the table and part of the effort involves research and development. So yes, I believe there is discussion on at least comparing the experiences and having a very transparent dialogue on research and development. I cannot say at this time what that might lead to other than simply letting each other know what we are doing.

Question: Nilesh Mishra from the *Associated Press*. Just to go a little beyond the jargon, what exactly can a cyber terrorist do? Is there a South Asian concern that you see here, especially with the situation that is within the region? Any special concerns you see here? And how precisely can that be? All we know of cyber terrorism, I mean I can speak for myself, are things like hacking or breaking into financial markets and things like that. But are there any other wider concerns there?

Answer: Yes. In order to understand cyber security it is very difficult, but it is necessary, nonetheless, to try to forget about the political map of the world because most of the time when there is some sort of an attack on systems the immediate need is to protect the system. Only later, perhaps much later, will it become known where the attack originated. I refer you to the Love Bug, which finally, after circling around the globe through many countries including Scandinavia and Latin America, ended up being in Southeast Asia in the hands of one individual. The focus of cyber security is truly security:

- how to protect systems from degradation;
- how to maintain assured performance of systems;
- how to protect information from corruption.

The actors involved could range from a simple hacker to more sophisticated groups to terrorist groups to criminals to states who may have certain sophisticated ambitions in terms of an internet terrorist attack. We don't know that at the time of the problem, so the orientation in the first instance is entirely defensive. There is, after that, an investigative and law enforcement aspect. Here again, it pays little regard to political boundaries and requires a great deal of international cooperation.

Question: I am Sandip from the *Hindu*. What did you discuss on modernization of the military ones? What are the defense items that have been cleared by the U.S. Congress to sell to India?

Answer: The focus of the discussions today, on the political military dialogue, was, in the first instance, more of a sharing of strategic view, a tour of the horizon of the political dimension of security. When we spoke of military modernization the intent, in the first instance, was for me

to introduce my bureau and to show in greater detail how the American arms transfer policy works and the fundamentals of that policy, as well as a bit of the bureaucratic aspect. There are some specific programs, both government-to-government as well as in the commercial defense licensing area, and a colleague of mine briefed the group in detail on the precise status of those programs. But I think my role was to ensure that we have a very good dialogue and very close communication to ensure that the foreign policy priorities of both governments in our bilateral relationship are well served by the programmatic coordination of our bureaucracies. So in a way I am somewhat of the lynch pin between the policy and the bureaucracy, and it is my hope and my belief that I will now be much better positioned to assure that the United States is being responsive to our high priorities that we attach to our relationship with India.

Question: Shivani Rawat from *Zee News*. I would like to know which other countries is the United States having this CIP dialogue. After your discussions with the Indians set up, what is the level of awareness that you find in India? How well is India geared up for this kind of thing?

Answer: We have spent the last year, under the first year of the President Bush's Administration, reorganizing the CIP effort nationally in the United States. And after the events of September 11th and the creation of the Office of Homeland Security there was a new dimension in terms of protecting other kinds of infrastructure as well as information. So there has been quite a bit of change on the U.S. side. As part of our effort we recognize that virtually the entire world, insofar as countries are participants in the cyber environment, needs to be brought into the dialogue. So rather than list one or two or three or four countries we have had bilateral meetings with some of the major economic players in the world those who are not on the list are not there simply because we have not had the time or the occasion. It is not a priority list in that instance. India has always been seen as a very important interlocutor in this effort. I will not characterize the Indian government's perspective; I will let them speak for themselves. We found the Indian delegation to be very well informed and to be very interested in examining the American experience as well as the organizational pattern that has been set up in the last year by the Bush Administration. Perhaps over time some of the American example will be beneficial to India and they may choose to orient their effort in other ways after considering what we have done.

Question: I am Josy Joseph, *India Abroad*. I presume the political military dialogue is an offshoot of September 11, 2001 along with other dialogues. At least, this is the first one that we are having at the formal stage. There has been a lot of concern among some sections of government in India that the U.S. military position is going to be strengthened in South Asia and it has the seeds of a possible future conflict with China, Russia, making Asia into a future conflict zone. I presume that with the political damage that you are discussing concerning the military what steps are you taking to ensure India or to other countries of the region that the U.S. military mobilization will not be having such cold wars? Are you initiating any conference or building measures? Even India is concerned that America is planning to set up some base in Colombia, I mean in Sri Lanka? What is America initiating towards insuring India and other countries that the U.S. movers will not have such long term follow ups on India security concerns?

Answer: In fact the political military dialogue is not a direct outgrowth of September 11, 2001. I would argue that it was delayed by the exigencies that flowed from September 11th because we place a high importance on this bilateral relationship and, if anything, I feel I could have come to New Delhi sooner, but I am very pleased that we had the chance to start this discussion. I think it should be very clear that the United States has no ambition to have permanent bases in this region. Indeed, you need look no further than Afghanistan to see an instance in which the U.S. was very clear on its purpose, took action which was not aimed against Afghanistan, and indeed facilitated the return of the control of this country to its own people. The U.S. supported the interim authority that came out of the Bonn agreement and we supported the

effort to create an International Security Assistance Force, a force in which the U.S. is not a participant. We were very much a member of the community of nations that assembled in Tokyo to pledge reconstruction assistance and humanitarian assistance, which is part of my portfolio as well, in the demining area so that Afghanistan can regain its own well being and sovereignty. We are just now at the stage of beginning some training for the Afghan army, which is the ultimate guarantor that Afghanistan can take care of itself. We have been helping to bring, I think, 80,000 tons of seed so that they can plant crops and feed hopefully the entire country if the rains are good. That is indicative of the U.S. posture. The U.S. does not covet military basing. We do appreciate international cooperation and access for our forces and for other countries, many other countries that are temporarily involved in this effort to fight global terrorism.

Question: There are a lot of concerns with the Indian government that the U.S. government has interest in setting up some sort of base. Is there a U.S. move to or is the U.S. looking at the possibility of setting up bases in Sri Lanka?

Answer: I have no information on a U.S. military base in Sri Lanka, and it is my understanding that the U.S. is not seeking permanent bases in this region other than what already exist.

Question: The Afghanistan example that you gave, certainly there is a move to produce an Afghan administration but there is very little evidence of American troops moving out of the area. They are still in Afghanistan, now in Pakistan, Uzbekistan, they are still there I presume. I am not really sure about that. But while the administration is being handed back, the troops still remain. What is the policy on that?

Answer: The troops, such as they are in Afghanistan, are solely geared to the initial mission, phase one of the global war on terrorism which was in the first instance, to unhinge the control of Taliban on the government of Afghanistan, which was accomplished. Secondly, to search out and to disable and hopefully destroy the al-Qaeda network. That job, as President Bush and Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld have said on many occasions, may take a long time. Indeed, we continue to believe there is a threat in some parts of Afghanistan, which if left to its own devices, could once again cause grave harm and security problems to the innocent people of Afghanistan. Our sole purpose is to succeed in the goals that have been clearly laid out from the beginning. This was never a hasty operation. It was always intended to be pursued in a deliberate fashion, even if it took a long time, and I think that is exactly what we are seeing now. The U.S. government would not want the wrong conclusion to be drawn. I think President Bush has been very clear on the purpose and very transparent. What you see is nothing more than a manifestation of the mission that he set out for the military.

Question: I am Sujana Dutt with the *Telegraph Newspaper*. Last week I think it was Secretary Powell said that over the past few months America has worked very actively with the governments in South Asia and has steadily but surely reshaped a number of relations in the battle against terrorism. Yet for the last three to four months we have two of America's greatest partners in the region, India and Pakistan, almost eyeball to eyeball on the border. Despite being partners in the coalition against terrorism, what is your assessment of the situation?

Answer: I think it is clear that the U.S. favors a vision of an outcome in which these two neighbors find a way to address their concerns mutually. We wish very much that this will be the case. You mentioned Secretary Powell who spent nine days, I believe, recently in the Middle East in a situation where the parties went beyond the brink and there are no winners. It is a very troubling and difficult situation. We just talked about Afghanistan. We could add to the list of issues that are burdens on the international security environment Colombia, the Balkans, the Korean Peninsula, the Congo, and on and on. So there is no question that the United States is

engaging with good will and intends to follow U.S. and India relations for a long, long time, on a very positive ascent. This is not a temporary or transitory relationship. We have turned the page and we are now building a positive future. We certainly reserve our highest admiration for the kind of statesmanship that can lead to resolution of these issues short of hostilities. We wish for the best.

Question: There has been some joint exercises involving the American and Indian troops. Are there any more? Can you tell if there are going to be more exercises?

Answer: I believe the answer is yes. The U.S. and India have a positive military-to-military relationship. I believe it is proceeding in a very positive direction, and I believe there will be more exercises and training in the very near future. But I do not have the details beyond this. Sorry.

Question: I am Vishal Thapar from the *Hindustan Times*. You talked about the export licensing procedure for arms. Which weapons systems, we know that the weapon locating radar, a deal has been signed, it has been cleared. Which other weapon systems have been cleared for possible sale to India? And I have a second question. You just talked about the exercises. The focus of these exercises we are told is to build interoperability between the forces of the two countries. What is your perspective of, what is your threat perception against what contingencies would interoperability of the two forces be required?

Answer: Actually I think both parts of your question pertain to the kind of long-term relationship that we have in mind. There are some cases that are in the system, and we did not dwell on the specific cases. In fact there are Defense Department channels in which both the defense establishments and the military sit around the table and they structure the appropriate elements of the defense relationship. From the Department of State we review it from a policy perspective and we engage the Congress in a dialogue to persuade them of the appropriateness of the decisions we have made. Both in those terms and also in terms of the kinds of activities that we might do in the training and exercise arena. The idea is not necessarily some sort of immediate contingency. The idea is getting India's next generation of military leaders and America's next generation of military leaders to get to know each other, and for each establishment to appreciate each other professionally. At the same time, at the political level, we talked today about the situation as it exists in 2002, but we also talked about twenty and even fifty years from now and the sort of strategic trend in the world. Our vision is of a peaceful world, one in which the software industry is ten times as big as it is today. As has always been the case, our military is there hopefully to protect the peace and to enable international commerce and to minimize the prospect that any particular violent contingency would occur. This is peacetime engagement.